

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested. The present amendment is submitted in conjunction with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. The RCE is submitted in response to the Final Office Action of October 10, 2003, in which claims 1-19 stand rejected. As a result of the amendment dated July 21, 2003, the previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 have been overcome. However, claim 11 has now been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention.

With regard to the art of record, claims 1, 5-12, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,883,432 to Higashiguchi, in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (IBM TDB), Vol. 38, No. 05 (May, 1995) entitled "Solder Plated Resin Ball". In addition, claims 2-4 and 13-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Higashiguchi, in view of IBM TDB, and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,337,522 to Kang, et al. For the following reasons, however, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

With regard to the §103 rejections based upon the art of record, the Applicants respectfully traverse the same, for the reason that a combination of the teachings of Higashiguchi and the IBM TDB would still not result in the claimed structure.

More specifically, in a telephone interview conducted on December 16, 2003, between the undersigned and Examiners John L. Goff and Jeff Aftergut, it was advanced by the Applicants that even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine the Higashiguchi and IBM TDB references, the resin balls encapsulated with solder shown in IBM TDB would be used in lieu of bumps 4 & 6 of Higashiguchi. That being the case,

there would be no need for the electrically conductive resin adhesive 10, 11 shown in Figure 2, since the conductive solder completely encapsulates the resin ball. Therefore, the claimed structure would not result from any suggested combination of the two references.

In addition, independent claim 20 has been added to more particularly point out that the first (and second) solderable cap is disposed in substantially planar contact with the conductive polymer composition. Support for this amendment is found at least in Figures 2, and Figures 5a-5c, as well as page 8, lines 18-19 and page 9, line 8 through page 11, line 3 of the specification. During the above referenced telephone interview, it was also pointed out that the solder material 3 disclosed by the IBM TDB reference completely encapsulates the resin ball 1 and barrier material 2. Accordingly, as reflected in the Interview Summary dated December 17, 2003, the IBM TDB does not teach or disclose substantially planar (i.e., non-continuous) caps. Thus, in view of the above, each of the §103 rejections to the remaining claims have been overcome, and it is respectfully requested that the same be withdrawn.

Finally, claim 11 has been amended to depend from newly added claim 20 in which, the term "completed" with respect to "interconnection" is not used, thereby overcoming the rejection to claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

For the above stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered and no additional fees are believed to be required. However, if any fees are due with respect to this Amendment, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,
CHARLES H. PERRY, ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorneys

By



Sean F. Sullivan
Registration No. 38,328
Customer No. 29371

Date: December 31, 2003
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929